

This quotation of course reminds us of the extremely unfortunate abuse the Bible is now taking throughout our nation, based on the fact that Morris and other extreme creationists have widely publicized their claim that the Bible flatly contradicts the scientific evidences for great age. Brush himself is not ordinarily harsh in his criticism of the Bible. So, in the final sentence of the above quotation, he throws the blame on Morris instead of on the Bible itself. Nevertheless, the effect of the entire article is the exposing of "scientific creationism" as an extremely unscientific set of ideas which should not become a part of classroom science instruction.

2. Many other prominent journals, including Science, Physics Today, The Science Teacher, and the Journal of Sedimentary Petrology, devoted a surprising number of pages to articles and discussion concerning young-earth creationism and its efforts to secure legislation requiring "equal time" in school classrooms. As with the articles in the Journal of Geological Education, emphasis in these journals was placed upon the creationist practice of neglecting or rejecting the research data which indicates great age.

Several semi-popular science magazines also lent their efforts to the cause of notifying the public of the apparently obscurantist nature of "creation science." Among these were Geotimes and Science 81 (Science 82 in 1982, etc). The latter, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and enjoying a very wide circulation in the United States, included 4 articles on the subject in its December 1981 issue--the month in which the Arkansas trial was convened. The creationist emphasis on a "6,000 to 10,000-year-old earth" is prominent in all 4 of the articles. The beginning paragraph, which introduces the section, ends with the summarizing sentence, "But it is not just biological evolution that is challenged by the creationists; their claims call into question nearly all of modern science, from astronomy to geophysics." (p. 53)

The article, "Creationism as Science" (p. 55-57), by Allen Hammond, the editor of the magazine, is written with reserve--not containing caustic or ridiculing statements. The following introductory parts of the article show the author's method and concern:

Creationism claims for itself the status of scientific theory, although most observers would describe it as religious belief. For the sake of argument, let us take the creationist assertions seriously as scientific propositions and explore their credibility and the consequences of their adoption....

The "theory" for which creationists so fiercely seek equal time in the classroom makes two principal, testable assertions about nature. First, the creationists claim that the age of the Earth and the rest of the known universe is approximately 6,000 to 10,000 years, a figure derived not by measurement but by literal interpretation of the Genesis story in the Bible. And second, the creationists claim that the present forms of life (plus others now extinct) did not evolve over billions of years but were all created in one week, about 10,000 years ago.... Adoption of creationist "theory" requires, at a minimum, the abandonment of essentially all of modern astronomy, much of modern physics, and most of the earth sciences. Much more than evolutionary biology is at stake. (p. 55)

To a point slightly beyond the middle of the article, Hammond discusses the fact that the earth and universe seem to be full of evidences for great age and that these evidences appear to be consistent with each other. He then points out that, to date, the "scientific creationists" had done little or nothing toward producing consistent theories or models which might provide alternative explanations of these evidences for long periods of time. Hammond (and the second author, Lynn Margulis, a biologist) then employ the last 3 columns of the